

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/641,350	SHAW ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Shane Bomar	3672	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(1) Shane Bomar.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Chandran Kumar.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 5 February 2007

**Time:** 10:45 am

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*36 and 40*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: I contacted Attorney Kumar because there appeared to be some typographical errors in the amendments to claims 36 and 40. It was agreed, via an Examiner's amendment, to add --with a subsea pump-- after chemical in line 6 of claim 36 and to remove "flowing" and "using a subsea pump" in the same line. It was further agreed to remove the first limitation of claim 40 leaving only one limitation in the claim, wherein the word "conveying" will also be removed.